
Two-Photon Decays Reexamined: Cascade Contributions and Gauge Invariance

Ulrich D. Jentschura

*Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Postfach 10 39 80, 69029 Heidelberg, Germany
and Institut für Theoretische Physik, Philosophenweg 16, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany*

The purpose of this paper is to calculate the two-photon decay rate corresponding to the two-photon transitions $nS \rightarrow 1S$ and $nD \rightarrow 1S$ in hydrogenlike ions with a low nuclear charge number Z (for principal quantum numbers $n = 2, \dots, 8$). Numerical results are obtained within a nonrelativistic framework, and the results are found to scale approximately as $(Z\alpha)^6/n^3$, where α is the fine-structure constant. We also attempt to clarify a number of subtle issues regarding the treatment of the coherent, quasi-simultaneous emission of the two photons as opposed to one-photon cascades. In particular, the gauge invariance of the decay rate is shown explicitly.

PACS numbers: 31.30.J-, 12.20.Ds, 32.80.Wr, 31.15.-p

1 Introduction

The subject of the current paper is the two-photon decay rate of excited atomic states, interpreted as the imaginary part of the two-loop self-energy. We follow our previous investigation reported in Ref. [1] and augment the analysis by treating the decay rate in both length and velocity gauges. Special emphasis is placed on the role of singularities, infinitesimally displaced from the integration contours for the photon energy integrations, which are generated by bound-state poles of lower energy than the reference state (in the sense of the two-loop self-energy). The reference state is equivalent to the initial state of the two-photon decay process. A good quantitative understanding of the two-photon decay processes from highly excited hydrogenic bound states is important for astrophysics, as emphasized in a recent paper by Chluba and Sunyaev [2]. As the physics of the process is in principle well known and has been discussed in a previous fast-track communication [1], we see no obstacle to going *in medias res* with the analysis.

Our purpose here, in addition to providing numerical data concerning the $D \rightarrow S$ transitions, is to clarify the role of cascades of one-photon decays through so-called resonant intermediate states, which are addressed using concepts developed in field theory [3, 4].

Natural units with $\hbar = c = \epsilon_0 = 1$, i.e. $e^2 = 4\pi\alpha$, are used throughout this paper, which is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, the gauge invariance of the two-photon decay rate, as derived from the two-loop self-energy, is reanalyzed. In Sec. 3, numerical results for $nD \rightarrow 1S$ transitions are presented; these were not treated in the previous paper [1]. A discussion of our results, including a comparison to previous investigations of two-photon decay from highly excited states (see Refs. [5–7]) is given in Sec. 4. Cascade contributions are analyzed in Sec. 5. Conclusions are drawn in Sec. 6.

2 Gauge Invariance

We start by considering the two-photon self-energy for a reference state $|\phi_i\rangle$ in a hydrogenlike ion, as derived from nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics (NRQED). In the velocity gauge, the interaction Hamiltonian of the quantized electromagnetic field with the electron is given by

$$H_I = -\frac{e}{2m} \left(\vec{p} \cdot \vec{A} + \vec{A} \cdot \vec{p} \right) + \frac{e^2 \vec{A}^2}{2m}, \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{A}$ is the vector potential of the quantized electromagnetic field.

The well-known expression (see, e.g., Refs. [1,8]) for the two-loop self-energy reads (ω_1 and ω_2 denote the energies of the two virtual quanta)

$$\Delta E_i^{(2)} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{2\alpha}{3\pi m^2} \right)^2 \int_0^{\Lambda_1} d\omega_1 \omega_1 \int_0^{\Lambda_2} d\omega_2 \omega_2 f_\epsilon(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \text{Re}\Delta E_i^{(2)} - i \frac{\delta\Gamma_i^{(1)}}{2} - i \frac{\Gamma_i^{(2)}}{2}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\text{Re}\Delta E_i^{(2)}$ is the real part of the energy shift, which gives rise, in particular, to the so-called two-loop Bethe logarithms [9]. Our treatment relies on the identification of the imaginary part of the energy shift in terms of a decay rate of the reference state, as suggested by Barbieri and Sucher in Ref. [10]. In Eq. (2), $\delta\Gamma_i^{(1)}$ is a correction to the one-photon decay rate, whereas $\Gamma_i^{(2)}$ is the two-photon decay rate. The former is obtained by terms where the integration over ω_1 or ω_2 meets a bound-state pole and generates an imaginary part, in the sense of Eq. (4) of Ref. [1], but the other photon energy is integrated with a principal-value prescription. The latter term, $\Gamma_i^{(2)}$, is obtained by selecting exclusively the imaginary part generated by the singularities at $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = E_i - E_v$, where E_v is a virtual state contained in one of the propagators. All expressions on the right-hand side of Eq. (2) are manifestly of order $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^6 m$, i.e. $(Z\alpha)^6 R_\infty$ where R_∞ is the Rydberg constant.

The function f_ϵ reads as follows (with all infinitesimal imaginary parts duly taken into account),

$$\begin{aligned} f_\epsilon(\omega_1, \omega_2) = & \left\langle \phi_i \left| p^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} p^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} p^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} p^k \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \phi_i \left| p^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} p^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} p^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} p^j \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \phi_i \left| p^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} p^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} p^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} p^j \right| \phi_i \right\rangle + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the terms denoted by the ellipsis are given in Eq. (3) of Ref. [1], being irrelevant for the current investigation, because the two-photon decay rate is generated exclusively by the poles where the sum $\omega_1 + \omega_2$ of both photon energies is on resonance. In a basis-set representation, the expression for the two-photon decay rate $\Gamma^{(2)}$ is thus found from the first three terms in Eq. (3) as [1]

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{(2)} = & \frac{4\alpha^2}{9\pi m^2} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_i - E_f} d\omega \omega (E_i - E_f - \omega) \left(\sum_v \left\{ \frac{\langle \phi_f | p^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | p^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_i - E_v - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle \phi_f | p^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | p^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_f - E_v + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right) \\ & \times \left(\sum_w \left\{ \frac{\langle \phi_i | p^k | \phi_w \rangle \langle \phi_w | p^j | \phi_f \rangle}{E_i - E_w - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle \phi_i | p^k | \phi_w \rangle \langle \phi_w | p^j | \phi_f \rangle}{E_f - E_w + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we use the summation convention for the Cartesian coordinates labeled by the indices $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The sum over v contains all virtual states, i.e. over the entire bound and continuous spectrum. We here imply a sum over the magnetic projections of the intermediate states, and of the final state of the decay process, but an averaging over magnetic projections of the initial state (since the decay rate does not depend on the magnetic projection of the initial state, one may alternatively choose any allowed value for the initial-state magnetic projection).

We now assume all initial and final, and virtual states to be given in terms of hydrogen wave functions in the standard representation (see, e.g., Ref. [11]), so that

$$\langle \phi_f | p^j | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | p^j | \phi_i \rangle = \langle \phi_i | p^j | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | p^j | \phi_f \rangle. \quad (5)$$

where the sum over j is assumed. We then do the angular algebra [12]. For $nS \rightarrow 1S$ decays, one obtains a result [1] which reproduces the well-known expression obtained by Göppert-Mayer in Ref. [13] for the particular case of $|\phi_i\rangle = |2S\rangle$,

$$\Gamma_{nS}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_{nS} - E_{1S}} d\omega \omega (E_{nS} - E_{1S} - \omega) \left(\sum_\nu \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nS \rangle}{E_{nS} - E_{\nu P} - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nS \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right)^2, \quad (6)$$

where we use the definition of the reduced matrix elements according to Ref. [12]. Virtual P states are also relevant for the decay $nD \rightarrow 1S$ decays, but the well-known prefactor is different [7], and the result is

$$\Gamma_{nD}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{135\pi m^2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_{nD} - E_{1S}} d\omega \omega (E_{nD} - E_{1S} - \omega) \left(\sum_\nu \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nD \rangle}{E_{nD} - E_{\nu P} - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nD \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right)^2, \quad (7)$$

where for completeness we note that the reduced matrix element for $P \rightarrow D$ transitions differs from the “radial” component of the matrix element by a factor $\sqrt{2}$.

In the length gauge, the atom-field interaction is given by

$$H_I = -e \vec{E} \cdot \vec{r}, \quad (8)$$

where $\vec{E}$ is the quantized electric-field operator. The length-gauge two-photon self-energy is obtained by straightforward fourth-order perturbation theory as

$$\Delta E_i^{(2)} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{2\alpha}{3\pi m^2} \right)^2 \int_0^{\Lambda_1} d\omega_1 \omega_1^3 \int_0^{\Lambda_2} d\omega_2 \omega_2^3 g_\epsilon(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \text{Re} \Delta E_i^{(2)} - i \frac{\delta \Gamma_i^{(1)}}{2} - i \frac{\Gamma_i^{(2)}}{2}. \quad (9)$$

We observe the factor $\omega_1^3 \omega_2^3$, which is characteristic of the length-gauge formulation. The absence of the seagull term as opposed to the velocity gauge leads to a somewhat simplified expression,

$$\begin{aligned} g_\epsilon(\omega_1, \omega_2) = & \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} x^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^k \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} x^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} x^j \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^j \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \\ & + \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} x^j \left(\frac{1}{E - H} \right)' x^k \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^k \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} x^j \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^k \left(\frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} \right)^2 x^k \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^j \frac{1}{E - H - \omega_2 + i\epsilon} x^j \right| \phi_i \right\rangle \left\langle \phi_i \left| x^k \left(\frac{1}{E - H - \omega_1 + i\epsilon} \right)^2 x^k \right| \phi_i \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In contrast to Eq. (3), the momentum operators are replaced by position operators. In analogy to Eq. (3), only the first three terms are relevant for the two-photon decay rate. Using a basis-set representation, the expression for the two-photon decay rate derived in the length gauge thus reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{(2)} = & \frac{4\alpha^2}{9\pi m^2} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_i - E_f} d\omega \omega^3 (E_i - E_f - \omega)^3 \left(\sum_v \left\{ \frac{\langle \phi_f | x^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | x^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_i - E_v - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle \phi_f | x^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | x^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_f - E_v + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right) \\ & \times \left(\sum_w \left\{ \frac{\langle \phi_i | x^k | \phi_w \rangle \langle \phi_w | x^j | \phi_f \rangle}{E_i - E_w - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle \phi_i | x^k | \phi_w \rangle \langle \phi_w | x^j | \phi_f \rangle}{E_f - E_w + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the sum over v contains all virtual states, Using the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_v \left\{ \frac{\langle \phi_f | p^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | p^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_i - E_v - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle \phi_f | p^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | p^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_f - E_v + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \\ & = \omega (E_i - E_f - \omega) \sum_v \left\{ \frac{\langle \phi_f | x^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | x^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_i - E_v - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle \phi_f | x^k | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | x^j | \phi_i \rangle}{E_f - E_v + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

it is easy to show the equivalence of the two expressions for the two-photon decay rate given in Eqs. (2) and (9). Note that this equivalence can be shown easily using the commutator relation $p^i = i[H, x^j]$, but it holds only if the sum over v extends over the complete spectrum.

Assuming hydrogen wave functions in the standard representation, we have that in analogy to Eq. (5),

$$\langle \phi_f | x^j | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | x^j | \phi_i \rangle = \langle \phi_i | x^j | \phi_v \rangle \langle \phi_v | x^j | \phi_f \rangle. \quad (13)$$

After angular algebra, one obtains for the decay $nS \rightarrow 1S$,

$$\Gamma_{nS}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_{nS}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega^3 (E_{nS} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \left(\sum_{\nu} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nS \rangle}{E_{nS} - E_{\nu P} - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nS \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right)^2, \quad (14)$$

whereas for $nD \rightarrow 1S$ decays,

$$\Gamma_{nD}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{135\pi m^2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_i-E_f} d\omega \omega^3 (E_{nD} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \left(\sum_{\nu} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nD \rangle}{E_{nD} - E_{\nu P} - \omega + i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nD \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega + i\epsilon} \right\} \right)^2, \quad (15)$$

again in complete analogy to Eqs. (6) and (7), respectively.

3 Numerical Results

We here focus on the $nS \rightarrow 1S$ and $nD \rightarrow 1S$ decays, as indicated in Eqs. (14) and (15), respectively. Decays to the ground state have the highest rate for both one-photon [14] as well as two-photon processes and are therefore of special interest. Due to the infinitesimal imaginary parts explicitly indicated in Eqs. (14) and (15), we can extend the sum over intermediate, virtual states over the entire hydrogenic spectrum, including those P states which have a lower energy than the reference state. We recall here that the double poles at intermediate resonances are naturally treated using the formula [1]

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^1 d\omega \left(\frac{1}{a - \omega + i\epsilon} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{a(a-1)}. \quad (16)$$

Simple poles are treated using the well-known Dirac prescription, and the principal-value integration then yields the real part of the integrals. Numerical results can be obtained by expressing the matrix elements with the propagators in terms in hypergeometric functions, following Refs. [15, 16]. Final values are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Numerical results for the decay rates $nS \rightarrow 1S$ and $nD \rightarrow 1S$ for hydrogen. The rates scale with Z^6 for a hydrogenlike ions with nuclear charge number Z . Units are inverse seconds. To obtain the decay rate in Hertz, one needs to divide by a factor of 2π . We here supplement the results given in Ref. [1] by some values for higher excited S states and we also indicated results for $nD \rightarrow 1S$, which were not treated in Ref. [1].

	$ \phi_f\rangle = 1S\rangle$		$ \phi_f\rangle = 1S\rangle$
$ \phi_i\rangle = 2S\rangle$	8.229 352		
$ \phi_i\rangle = 3S\rangle$	2.082 853	$ \phi_i\rangle = 3D\rangle$	1.042 896
$ \phi_i\rangle = 4S\rangle$	0.698 897	$ \phi_i\rangle = 4D\rangle$	0.598 798
$ \phi_i\rangle = 5S\rangle$	0.287 110	$ \phi_i\rangle = 5D\rangle$	0.340 883
$ \phi_i\rangle = 6S\rangle$	0.135 935	$ \phi_i\rangle = 6D\rangle$	0.206 523
$ \phi_i\rangle = 7S\rangle$	0.071 402	$ \phi_i\rangle = 7D\rangle$	0.132 928
$ \phi_i\rangle = 8S\rangle$	0.040 587	$ \phi_i\rangle = 8D\rangle$	0.090 016

The one-loop as well as the two-loop self-energy shifts of hydrogenic states are well known to follow scaling laws of the form of inverse powers of the principal quantum number n , as analyzed in Ref. [17]. The two-photon decay rate is the imaginary part of this energy shift and is thus expected to follow an analogous trend with the principal quantum numbers. Analyzing the data in Table 1, we find that the $nD \rightarrow 1S$ state results appear to follow the asymptotic behaviour (expressed in inverse seconds)

$$\Gamma_{nD}^{(2)} = \frac{49(2)}{n^3} Z^6 s^{-1}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (17)$$

whereas for $nS \rightarrow 1S$ decay, a fractional power apparently leads to a more satisfactory representation of the data,

$$\Gamma_{nS}^{(2)} = \frac{330(20)}{n^{4.3}} Z^6 s^{-1}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (18)$$

The results indicated in Table 1 are consistent with a decrease of the two-photon decay rate with increasing n .

4 Discussion and Comparison

When comparing to the existing literature, it is useful, first of all, to note the calculations [2,5,6], which are apparently based on second-order perturbation theory for the two-photon transition amplitude. As a consequence, they present singularities when the energy of one of the photons reaches a level situated between the initial and final states, and no procedure is given in the cited references if one does not go beyond second order. When evaluating differential transition rates (Refs. [5,18,19]), the absence of the infinitesimal imaginary part does not matter, and the numerical results in the velocity gauge [5,19] and in the length gauge [18] fully agree. The problem arises when one tries to evaluate the total decay rate, as the existing singularities are not integrable. Although in Ref. [7] fourth-order perturbation theory was used, a consistent answer does not appear to have been found.

It appears that in general, two approaches have been used so far in the literature in order to deal with the problematic double poles for the photon energy integrations: (i) the explicit removal of particular states from the sum over virtual states, and (ii) the inclusion of a width for the intermediate, virtual states.

Let us begin the discussion with the removal of states. Indeed, Chluba and Sunyaev [2], Florescu *et al.* [6] as well as Cresser *et al.* [7] have used different formulas than those used here, in order to evaluate the two-photon decay rates. In particular, they use instead of Eq. (14) the following formula for $nS \rightarrow 1S$ decays,

$$\gamma_{nS}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \int_0^{E_{nS}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega^3 (E_{nS} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \left| \sum_{\nu \geq N} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nS \rangle}{E_{nS} - E_{\nu P} - \omega} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nS \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega} \right\} \right|^2, \quad (19)$$

where $N = n$ (Chluba and Sunyaev, Ref. [2]) or $N = n+1$ (Florescu *et al.* [5,6] and Cresser *et al.*, Ref. [7]), and the notation $\nu \geq N$ of course means that one should sum over the discrete spectrum for all virtual states with principal quantum numbers as indicated, and of course integrate over the entire continuum spectrum in addition. For $nD \rightarrow 1S$ decays, the cited authors use

$$\gamma_{nD}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{135\pi m^2} \int_0^{E_{nD}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega^3 (E_{nD} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \left| \sum_{\nu \geq N} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nD \rangle}{E_{nD} - E_{\nu P} - \omega} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nD \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega} \right\} \right|^2, \quad (20)$$

with the same proposed values for N . In this case, because the problematic virtual states of lower energy than the initial state $|\phi_i\rangle$ have been explicitly removed from the sum over virtual states, there are no more singularities infinitesimally displaced from the integration contours present, and there is therefore no need for any infinitesimal imaginary part $i\epsilon$ in the propagator denominators. Furthermore, $|\cdot|^2$ is equivalent to $(\cdot)^2$ provided our assumption formulated in Eq. (5) holds. The corresponding velocity-gauge expressions,

$$\eta_{nS}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \int_0^{E_{nS}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega (E_{nS} - E_{1S} - \omega) \left| \sum_{\nu \geq N} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nS \rangle}{E_{nS} - E_{\nu P} - \omega} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nS \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega} \right\} \right|^2, \quad (21)$$

and

$$\eta_{nD}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{135\pi m^2} \int_0^{E_{nD}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega (E_{nD} - E_{1S} - \omega) \left| \sum_{\nu \geq N} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nD \rangle}{E_{nD} - E_{\nu P} - \omega} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{p} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{p} || nD \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega} \right\} \right|^2, \quad (22)$$

are not equivalent to the length-gauge expressions in Eqs. (19) and (20), because the relation (12) breaks down if the sum over ν does not extend over the entire hydrogen spectrum. The explicit removal of the “problematic” virtual states from the propagators avoids the necessity of indicating the infinitesimal imaginary terms in the propagator denominators, but the removal operation leads to different expressions in the length and the velocity gauges and is thus not gauge invariant.

To illustrate this finding by a numerical example, we observe that we can reproduce the value of $\gamma_{3D}^{(2)} = 0.131\,813\,\text{s}^{-1}$ for the decay $3D \rightarrow 1S$ with $N = n + 1$ using the length-gauge expression (20), in agreement with Eq. (20) of Ref. [7]. However, the velocity gauge expression (22) gives a different result, namely $\eta_{3D}^{(2)} = 0.439\,368\,\text{s}^{-1}$. These two results have to be contrasted with the gauge-invariant result of $\Gamma_{3D}^{(2)} = 1.042\,896\,\text{s}^{-1}$, indicated in Table 1. For the decay $3S \rightarrow 1S$, the values are $\gamma_{3S}^{(2)} = 8.225\,796\,\text{s}^{-1}$ in agreement with Eq. (19) of Ref. [7], and the velocity-gauge result with $2P$ and $3P$ virtual states removed is $\eta_{3S}^{(2)} = 6.192\,881\,\text{s}^{-1}$, whereas the gauge-invariant result with the full hydrogenic spectrum of virtual states reads $\Gamma_{3S}^{(2)} = 2.082\,853\,\text{s}^{-1}$ (see Table 1). It is interesting to observe that $\Gamma_{3D}^{(2)} > \gamma_{3D}^{(2)}$, but $\Gamma_{3S}^{(2)} < \gamma_{3S}^{(2)}$.

Let us now turn our attention to the inclusion of a decay width for the intermediate states. Indeed, the authors of Refs. [2, 5–7] arrive at the expressions (21) and (22) after analyzing the expression (for illustrative purposes we restrict ourselves here to the $nS \rightarrow 1S$ decay)

$$\frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \int_0^{E_{nS}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega^3 (E_{nS} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \left| \sum_{\nu} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nS \rangle}{E_{nS} - E_{\nu P} - \omega + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_{\nu}^{(1)}} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || nS \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_{\nu}^{(1)}} \right\} \right|^2. \quad (23)$$

Let us consider $3S$ state as an example. The only “problematic” virtual state is the $2P$ state ($\nu = 2$), and using the formula

$$\int_0^1 d\omega \left| \frac{1}{a - \omega + i\Gamma} \right|^2 = \frac{\pi}{\Gamma} + \frac{1}{a(a-1)} + \mathcal{O}(\Gamma^2), \quad (24)$$

it is possible to show, that the term with $\nu = 2$ in the expression (23) gives rise to a contribution which is equivalent to the one-photon decay rate $3S \rightarrow 2P$, and this decay rate is just the total one-photon decay rate of the $3S$ state, and it is equal to the imaginary part of the one-loop self-energy of the $3S$ state (in the dipole approximation). The authors of Refs. [2, 5–7] thus conclude that this term should be interpreted as the one-photon decay rate of the $3S$ state, which has got nothing to do with the two-photon decay process, and this observation appears to be the basis for their removal of the $2P$ state from the sum over virtual states (see also the analysis in footnote 4 of Ref. [7]).

Despite the appealing aspects of the removal operation, it is unfortunately not gauge invariant, as shown above, and we would like to point out two more aspects that merit a discussion. First and foremost, the discussion in footnote 4 of Ref. [7] shows that the expression (23) gives rise to a one-photon decay rate, effectively mixing the two-loop self-energy with the one-photon self-energy (according to the interpretation of a decay rate as an imaginary part of an energy shift). If one would take the expression (23) literally, then one should be careful to avoid a double counting of the one-photon decay rate, which is already contained in the one-loop self-energy and should not be obtained once more from the imaginary part of the two-loop self-energy. Cascade contributions are discussed in more detail in Sec. 5 below.

The second aspect is observed when the analysis in footnote 4 of Ref. [7] is generalized to the $4S \rightarrow 1S$ decay. In that case, two cascades are possible, namely $4S \rightarrow 3P \rightarrow 1S$ and $4S \rightarrow 2P \rightarrow 1S$. As an easy generalization of the analysis in footnote 4 of Ref. [7] shows, the full one-photon decay rate of the $4S$ state is obtained from the expression (23) only if the virtual $2P$ and $3P$ are endowed with their *partial* decay rates to the $1S$ ground state, i.e. the $3P$ decay rate should be inserted into the propagator denominators as the *partial* decay rate $3P \rightarrow 1S$, excluding the decay process $3P \rightarrow 2S$. If one generalizes these considerations further, namely to a general decay $nS \rightarrow 1S$, then this would imply that one should use different decay rates $\Gamma_{\nu}^{(1)}$ in Eq. (23) to regularize the divergence in $1/\Gamma_{\nu}^{(1)}$ in Eq. (24), adjusting them according to the decay process under study. That prescription would be highly counterintuitive as the virtual states should somehow “know” about properties of the initial and final states of the decay process. The ensuing questions have already been noticed by Chluba and Sunyaev [2].

Let us conclude this section with a remark on the asymptotics (17) and (18), which permit an extrapolation of our results to Rydberg states with high principal quantum numbers. Some investigations, including Ref. [2], lead to results for the two-photon decay rates of higher excited state which exhibit a linear increase with n instead of a decrease with at least n^{-3} , as indicated in Eqs. (17) and (18). It is well-known that the one-photon rates decrease approximately with n^{-3} (see Ref. [14]). If the two-photon rates would indeed increase linearly, then there would be a relative factor n^4 with which two-photon rates would grow in comparison to one-photon rates as the principal quantum number of a state increases. If we take into account the relative scaling factor of $Z^2\alpha^3/\pi$ by which two-photon rates are suppressed with respect to one-photon rates, then we would have to conclude that the two-photon rates overtake the one-photon rates for states with a comparatively low principal quantum number of $n \approx 50/\sqrt{Z}$ in a hydrogenlike ion with nuclear charge number Z . For our results as indicated in Table 1, the two-photon rates are suppressed with respect to one-photon rates by a relative factor $Z^2\alpha^3/\pi$ for all hydrogenic states, because the scaling with n is obtained to be approximately the same for the one- as well as the two-photon rates, and the natural hierarchy of the likelihood of one- and two-photon events is preserved for all states.

5 Extraction of the Cascade Contribution

As in Sec. 4, let us focus on a particular example whose generalization is obvious, namely (this time) the $3S \rightarrow 1S$ decays, for which the cascade $3S \rightarrow 2P \rightarrow 1S$ needs to be addressed. Let us go back once more to Eq. (14),

$$\Gamma_{3S}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_{3S}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega^3 (E_{3S} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \left(\sum_{\nu} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle}{(E_{3S} - E_{\nu P} - \omega + i\epsilon)} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle}{(E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega + i\epsilon)} \right\} \right)^2, \quad (25)$$

and adopt the cumbersome, but absolutely unique notation P.V. for the principal value part of the distribution. If we use the formula

$$\frac{1}{x + i\epsilon} = (\text{P.V.}) \frac{1}{x} - i\pi \delta(x) \quad (26)$$

for all propagator denominators in Eq. (25) and extract only the contribution due to the delta functions, then the only contributing virtual state is the $2P$ state. Because there is a product of two terms both of which become singular, we cannot avoid to obtain the square of the delta function,

$$\delta^2(\omega - E_{3S} - E_{2P}) = \delta(0) \delta(\omega - E_{3S} - E_{2P}) = \frac{T}{2\pi} \delta(\omega - E_{3S} - E_{2P}), \quad (27)$$

and a further term proportional to $\delta(\omega - E_{2P} + E_{1S}) T/(2\pi)$. Here, T is the (long) observation time proportional to $\delta(0)$ in energy space (see, e.g. Ref. [3]). The sum of the terms proportional to $\delta(0)$ reads

$$C_{3S}^{(2)} = -T \Gamma_{3S \rightarrow 2P}^{(1)} \Gamma_{2P \rightarrow 1S}^{(1)}, \quad \int dT C_{3S}^{(2)} = -\frac{T^2}{2} \Gamma_{3S \rightarrow 2P}^{(1)} \Gamma_{2P \rightarrow 1S}^{(1)}, \quad (28)$$

where we introduce an obvious notation for the partial one-photon rates $\Gamma_{3S \rightarrow 2P}^{(1)}$ and $\Gamma_{2P \rightarrow 1S}^{(1)}$. Note, in particular, that the resulting expression for $C_{3S}^{(2)}$ is gauge invariant.

Our result (28) has just the right form to describe the cascade decay, except for the “wrong” sign. For the term to contribute to the decay of the $3S$ state, it should be positive, but it turns out to be negative. Let us defer a discussion of this issue and instead consider the extraction of the cascade contribution from the expression

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{3S}^{(2)} = \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{E_{3S}-E_{1S}} d\omega \omega^3 (E_{3S} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \prod_{\pm} \sum_{\nu} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle}{E_{3S} - E_{\nu P} - \omega \pm i\epsilon} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega \pm i\epsilon} \right\}, \quad (29)$$

where $\prod_{\pm}$ means the product of two terms, with either sign. The product over the two terms with $\pm i\epsilon$ is of course equivalent to the square of the modulus of the two terms in the integrand, in analogy to Eq. (23). If we now use (26), then we obtain

$$\tilde{C}_{3S}^{(2)} = T \Gamma_{3S \rightarrow 2P}^{(1)} \Gamma_{2P \rightarrow 1S}^{(1)}, \quad \int dT \tilde{C}_{3S}^{(2)} = \frac{T^2}{2} \Gamma_{3S \rightarrow 2P}^{(1)} \Gamma_{2P \rightarrow 1S}^{(1)}. \quad (30)$$

This result has the “right” sign, and it has, for large T , the right temporal dependence for a cascade process.

In order to resolve the paradox, one first should notice that both signs found in Eqs. (28) and (30) actually have a valid interpretation. The two-loop self-energy contains both radiative corrections to the one-photon decay as well as the full two-photon decay amplitude. The radiative corrections to one-photon decay are obtained by “cutting” appropriate internal lines in the diagrams, and indeed, we can rederive the first three radiative corrections to one-photon as given in Eq. (27) of Ref. [20] by considering resonant intermediate states in the “outer” electron propagators in the terms of Eq. (3). (The remaining terms used in Eq. (27) of Ref. [20] follow from standard third-order perturbation theory.) The magnitude of the radiative corrections to one-photon decay is decreased by the possibility of cascade processes, due to the virtual-to-real conversion of the photons appearing in the integrals for the radiative corrections to the one photon decay at resonance, and this decrease is consistent with the sign of the right-hand side of Eq. (28). On the other hand, the two-photon decay amplitude should be increased by the cascade processes, and this increase is consistent with the sign of the right-hand side of Eq. (30).

In the sum of the radiative corrections to one-photon decay and the two-photon decay, the incoherent cascade contributions cancel, and this is in analogy to the discussion in Ref. [3] for a different, but physically related process, namely the coherent/incoherent pair production via a virtual/real photon intermediate state by an electron in crossed, static electromagnetic fields.

Immediately, new questions arise. Our considerations suggest that our formulation in Eq. (3) provides infinitesimal imaginary parts that are appropriate for the evaluation of radiative corrections to the one-photon decay, but provides

the “wrong” sign of the cascades for two-photon decays. This could lead to new doubt regarding whether we can extract a valid expression for the two-photon decay rate from our Eq. (3) in the first place. The question is: Can we extract, by some mathematically justifiable procedure, from Eq. (29), an expression for the two-photon decay rate which either confirms or invalidates our result for the two-photon decay rate, under a suitable gauge-invariant subtraction of the cascade contribution from the integrand in (29)?

First, since the cascade contributions correspond to the delta function in Eq. (26), it is clear that the two-photon decay rate corresponds to the product of two principal-value distributions of the form,

$$\left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right) \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right) = \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right)^2, \quad (31)$$

which is integrated over ω . As similar problems have occurred in field theory [see Eq. (6.23) on p. 168 of Ref. [4]], we are provided with a guiding principle for the calculation. Namely, we consider an arbitrary function f , integrated over a finite interval $(0, \omega_{\max})$ with $f(0) = f(\omega_{\max}) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega f(\omega) \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right)^2 &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega f(\omega) \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0 + \eta} \right) \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right) \\ &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega f(\omega) \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} - \text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0 + \eta} \right) \\ &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega [f(\omega) - f(\omega - \eta)] \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right) \\ &= \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} (f(\omega) - f(\omega_0)) \right] \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right) \\ &= - \frac{\omega_{\max} f(\omega_0)}{\omega_0 (\omega_{\max} - \omega_0)} + \text{P.V.} \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega \frac{f(\omega) - f(\omega_0)}{(\omega - \omega_0)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

This subtraction, applied to Eq. (29), gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{3S}^{(2)} &= \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \text{P.V.} \int_0^{E_{3S} - E_{1S}} d\omega \left(\omega^3 (E_{3S} - E_{1S} - \omega)^3 \left| \sum_{\nu} \left\{ \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle}{E_{3S} - E_{\nu P} - \omega} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || \nu P \rangle \langle \nu P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle}{E_{1S} - E_{\nu P} + \omega} \right\} \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (E_{3S} - E_{2P})^3 (E_{2P} - E_{1S})^3 \left(\frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || 2P \rangle^2 \langle 2P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle^2}{(E_{3S} - E_{2P} - \omega)^2} + \frac{\langle 1S || \vec{x} || 2P \rangle^2 \langle 2P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle^2}{(E_{2P} - E_{1S} - \omega)^2} \right) \right) + \frac{4\alpha^2}{27\pi m^2} \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Here, we have subtract the cascade-generating terms according to Eq. (32), thus leading to an integral which is finite under a principal-value prescription, because the double poles have explicitly been subtracted. Because the prescription (32) takes the numerators to exact resonance, the subtraction terms in (33) are gauge invariant and indeed proportional to $\Gamma_{3S \rightarrow 2P}^{(1)} \Gamma_{2P \rightarrow 1S}^{(1)}$. The additional term $\mathcal{F}$ is due to the boundary term found in (32),

$$\mathcal{F} = -2(E_{3S} - E_{1S})(E_{3S} - E_{2P})^2 (E_{2P} - E_{1S})^2 \langle 1S || \vec{x} || 2P \rangle^2 \langle 2P || \vec{x} || 3S \rangle^2. \quad (34)$$

Finally, returning to our original $i\epsilon$ prescription, we have according to Eq. (16),

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega \frac{f(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_0 + i\epsilon)^2} = - \frac{\omega_{\max} f(\omega_0)}{\omega_0 (\omega_{\max} - \omega_0)} \quad (35)$$

and in view of (32) and (35), we obtain the (perhaps somewhat surprising) equality

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Re} \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega \frac{f(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_0 + i\epsilon)^2} = \int_0^{\omega_{\max}} d\omega f(\omega) \left(\text{P.V.} \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right)^2, \quad (36)$$

which is subject to the interpretation of the squared principal-value contribution according to Eq. (32). We can finally state that the result (33) agrees with formula (25), so that, under the provisions of the regularization implied by Eq. (32), it is irrelevant if we start from an expression where the integrand for the two-photon decay is formulated as a modulus squared or with two infinitesimal imaginary parts “pointing in the same direction.”

6 Conclusions

We have analyzed two-photon decay processes involving $nS \rightarrow 1S$ and $nD \rightarrow 1S$ channels in hydrogenlike ions. Our general formulas (4) and (11) are gauge-invariant and are obtained with otherwise unspecified, arbitrary infinitesimal imaginary parts $i\epsilon$, provided the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is taken after the integrations over the photon energies have been performed (non-uniform convergence). Numerical results are presented in Table 1. These are nonrelativistic results which scale as Z^6 with the nuclear charge number Z . For a relativistic generalization, see [21].

From a more philosophical point of view, we can say that the two-photon decay process turns out to be an extremely subtle physical phenomenon, which demands a lot of mathematical sophistication in its analysis. Without a careful handling of the distributions, including ill-defined squares of delta functions, it is impossible to obtain consistent answers. The current work attempts to provide a proposal for a consistent framework in which the resonant intermediate states and the generated double poles can be addressed, while preserving the interpretation of the integrand of the two-photon decay rate as a differential decay rate with respect to the photon energy.

Three remarks conclude this work. (i) Following Ref. [3], we should point out that there is no guarantee that the coherent two-photon decay rate as evaluated here always needs to be positive (except for the $2S$ state, where no resonant intermediate states are present). Indeed, as Eq. (33) shows, the result is obtained as a subtracted integral, and the integrand is not necessarily positive. For all transitions considered here, the rate is positive (see Table 1), but it is known that radiative corrections to decay rates can be negative, and the coherent two-particle contribution to a decay rate beyond the cascade constitutes a correction to a decay rate which need not be positive. This statement is paradoxical, but we can point out that this statement has already been confirmed after Eq. (20) of Ref. [3] in an absolutely analogous situation. (ii) The observation time T as implied in Eq. (30) has to be sufficiently large (larger than the typical formation time of radiation in the system, according to Ref. [3], or otherwise the decay process will proceed in a different way). In our case, the natural formation time of radiation is given by a time inversely related to the decay width of the decaying states, which is naturally identified as the one-photon decay rate of the highly excited states. (iii) It may seem that the agreement of the integration around the infinitesimally displaced poles as described in Sec. 2 and the regularized principal-value prescription as described in Sec. 5 is purely accidental. However, one should remember that similar integrals appear in Lamb-shift related self-energy calculations (e.g., Ref. [22]), and therefore, the predictions for the Lamb shift of excited states would have had to be reinvestigated if we had not found agreement of the two computational schemes discussed here. Fortunately, the internal consistency of mathematics protects us from having to reinvestigate accurate theoretical predictions based on quantum electrodynamics.

Acknowledgment

Helpful discussion with A. Surzhykov, A. I. Milstein, P. J. Mohr, F. Khan and K. Pachucki are gratefully acknowledged. This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Heisenberg program, contract JE285/3-1).

References

- [1] U. D. Jentschura, J. Phys. A **40**, F223 (2007).
- [2] J. Chluba and R. A. Sunyaev, e-print 0705.3033 [astro-ph].
- [3] V. I. Ritus, Nucl. Phys. B **44**, 236 (1972).
- [4] V. N. Baier, V. M. Katkov, and V. M. Strakhovenko, *Electromagnetic Processes At High Energies in Oriented Single Crystals* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).
- [5] V. Florescu, Phys. Rev. A **30**, 2441 (1984).
- [6] V. Florescu, I. Schneider, and I. N. Mihailescu, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 2189 (1988).
- [7] J. D. Cresser, A. Z. Tang, G. J. Salamo, and F. T. Chan, Phys. Rev. A **33**, 1677 (1986).
- [8] K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 042503 (2001).
- [9] K. Pachucki and U. D. Jentschura, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 113005 (2003).
- [10] R. Barbieri and J. Sucher, Nucl. Phys. B **134**, 155 (1978).

- [11] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics (Volume 3 of the Course of Theoretical Physics)* (Pergamon Press, London, 1958).
- [12] D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moskalev, and V. K. Khersonskii, *Quantum Theory of Angular Momentum* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988).
- [13] M. Göppert-Mayer, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **9**, 273 (1931).
- [14] H. A. Bethe and E. E. Salpeter, *Quantum Mechanics of One- and Two-Electron Atoms* (Springer, Berlin, 1957).
- [15] M. Gavrilă and A. Costescu, Phys. Rev. A **2**, 1752 (1970).
- [16] K. Pachucki, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **226**, 1 (1993).
- [17] U. D. Jentschura, E.-O. Le Bigot, P. J. Mohr, P. Indelicato, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 163001 (2003).
- [18] J. H. Tung, X. M. Ye, G. J. Salamo, and F. T. Chan, Phys. Rev. A **30**, 1175 (1984).
- [19] V. Florescu, S. Patrascu, and O. Stoican, Phys. Rev. A **36**, 2155 (1987).
- [20] J. Sapirstein, K. Pachucki, and K. T. Cheng, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022113 (2004).
- [21] A. Surzhykov and U. D. Jentschura, submitted (2008).
- [22] U. D. Jentschura, G. Soff, and P. J. Mohr, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 1739 (1997).